

REMARKS

Please reconsider this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

- Claims 1-44 are pending.
- Claims 11, 12 and 20 are withdrawn
- Claims 1-10, 13-19, 21 and 22 are rejected.
- Claims 23-44 are newly added.

Applicant's claims recite that a compound be "implanted at a depth within at least a region of a surface of the stent." The cited combination does not teach a compound that is "implanted at a depth..." as that phrase is used by Applicant as evidenced by the specification as a whole. Because prima facie obviousness requires that the "obviousness" case deal with each element of the claims and because the implanted-at-a-depth limitation is lacking, prima facie obviousness has not been made out. Please remove the rejection of claims 1-10, 13-19, 21, and 22.

Patentability Of New Claims

All of the newly added claims recite the limitation that a compound is "implanted by plasma reaction". Apparently, the cited prior art does not teach this element. Therefore, the newly added claims are patentable over the prior art.

Since all claims are in a condition for allowance, please issue a Notice of Allowability so stating. If I can be of any help, please contact me.

Express Mail No. EV 337 976 066 US

PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: 50623.00061

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 8, 2005

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
One Maritime Plaza
Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94111
Facsimile (415) 393-9887
Telephone (415) 954-0235
crunyan@ssd.com



Charles E. Runyan, Ph.D.
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 43,066